

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08146 01 OF 02 261845Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
-----128326 261850Z /41
P 261832Z MAY 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0161
INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
USMISSION USNATO

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 08146

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1
TAGS: PARM
SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 218, MAY 25, 1978
(SALT TWO 1765)

REFS: A. SALT TWO 1760 B. SALT TWO 1766

SUMMARY: SOVIETS POSED NUMEROUS QUESTIONS ON US PROPOSAL FOR COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON MIRV LAUNCHER DISTINGUISHABILITY FOR WHICH US TABLED REVISED LANGUAGE. US TABLED PROPOSAL FOR ASSURED INOPERABILITY AND RATE OF DISMANTLING (AGREED STATEMENT TO XI.3); SOVIET RESPONSE ABRUPT: SMOLIN STATED HE WAS UNDER INSTRUCTIONS NOT TO DISCUSS US PROPOSAL IN DRAFTING GROUP. US ALSO TABLED REVISED LANGUAGE FOR VI.5, CONVERSION OF AIRPLANES TO CMC. END SUMMARY.

1. PRIOR TO MEETING SMOLIN TOLD PEREZ HE WAS NOT AUTHORIZED TO DISCUSS PREVIOUS DAY'S US PROPOSAL (REF A) ON ASSURED INOPERABILITY AND RATE OF DISMANTLING. IF US TABLED THIS PROPOSAL IN DRAFTING GROUP, HE WOULD HAVE TO
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08146 01 OF 02 261845Z

MAKE "HARSH" STATEMENT. PEREZ SAID THAT US PROPOSAL WAS INTEGRAL PART OF EARLIER US PROPOSALS ON DISMANTLING/DESTRUCTION, WHICH CHIEFS OF DELEGATION HAD AGREED COULD BE DISCUSSED IN DRAFTING GROUP, AND THEREFORE HE INTENDED TO TABLE YESTERDAY'S US PROPOSAL IN THE DRAFTING GROUP TODAY.

- I. US-PROPOSED FIFTH COMMON UNDERSTANDING TO ARTICLE

- II.5 (MIRV LAUNCHER DISTINGUISHABILITY)

2. IN COURSE OF DISCUSSION, US TABLED REVISED LANGUAGE (REF B) MAKING EXPLICIT THAT PROVISION COVERED CHANGES TO MIRV AS WELL AS TO NON-MIRV LAUNCHERS. SMOLIN ASKED ABOUT OBJECTIVES OF THE US PROPOSAL, AND ABOUT LAUNCHERS TO WHICH IT REFERRED. PEREZ EXPLAINED PURPOSE AS ENHANCING VERIFICATION AND AVOIDING FUTURE AMBIGUOUS SITUATIONS. HE SAID US PROPOSAL WOULD APPLY TO ALL ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS, EXCEPT THOSE FOR WHICH MODIFICATION OR CONVERSION PROGRAMS WERE ALREADY UNDERWAY AT DATE OF SIGNATURE OF TREATY.

3. SMOLIN ASKED WHETHER US PROPOSAL APPLIED TO EXISTING LAUNCHERS. PEREZ SAID IT DID NOT APPLY UNLESS THESE WERE MODIFIED OR CONVERTED (E.G., CHANGED FROM NON-MIRV TO MIRV) AFTER ENTRY INTO FORCE OF TREATY. SMOLIN THEN ASKED WHETHER LAST SENTENCE OF US PROPOSAL REFERRED TO "TYPES" OF LAUNCHERS; FOR EXAMPLE, IF ONE LAUNCHER HAD UNDERGONE, OR WAS IN PROCESS OF, CONVERSION AT DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE, COULD OTHER LAUNCHERS OF SAME TYPE BE CONVERTED IN THE SAME WAY, I.E., WOULD THEY BE EXEMPTED FROM OBLIGATIONS OF US PROPOSAL? SCHNEITER RESPONDED IN AFFIRMATIVE.

4. SMOLIN ASKED WHY US FELT NEED FOR GREATER PRECISION ON THIS POINT, SINCE SIDES' INTEREST CLEARLY SERVED BY HAVING DIFFERENT TYPES OF LAUNCHERS LOOK DIFFERENT. PEREZ AGREED
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 08146 01 OF 02 261845Z

WITH SMOLIN'S PREMISE BUT ADDED THAT, IN US VIEW, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO HAVE EXPLICIT INDIVIDUAL OBLIGATION ON MIRV/ NON-MIRV DISTINGUISHABILITY. IN ANSWER TO QUESTION BY SMOLIN ON APPLICABILITY OF US PROPOSAL TO A SIDE'S REPLACEMENT OF ONE TYPE OF SINGLE-RV MISSILE IN A LAUNCHER OF SINGLE-RV MISSILES BY ANOTHER TYPE OF SINGLE-RV MISSILE, SCHNEITER RESPONDED THAT (1) US WOULD NOT TERM THIS CONVERSION, SINCE IT DID NOT CHANGE HOW THAT LAUNCHER COUNTED UNDER TREATY AND (2) IF EXTERNALLY OBSERVABLE STRUCTURAL DESIGN FEATURES (SDF) WERE CHANGED, LAUNCHERS WOULD HAVE TO BE DISTINGUISHABLE FROM MIRV LAUNCHERS. SMOLIN COMPLAINED THAT TERM USED IN DIFFERENT WAY IN OTHER JDT PROVISIONS, E.G., ARTICLE VII.2(B).

5. SMOLIN THEN ASKED WHETHER NEWLY CONSTRUCTED MIRV LAUNCHERS WOULD HAVE TO BE DISTINGUISHABLE FROM ALL NON-MIRV LAUNCHERS, AND VICE VERSA; SCHNEITER CONFIRMED. KOUKLEV ASKED IF A NEW NON-MIRV LAUNCHER WOULD HAVE TO DIFFER FROM AN "OLD" NON-MIRV LAUNCHER; SCHNEITER SAID NO.

6. SMOLIN ASKED FOR EXAMPLES OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN "MODERNIZATION" AND "MODIFICATION". PEREZ REPLIED THAT MODERN-

IZATION WAS A BROADER TERM THAN MODIFICATION. SCHNEITER ADDED THAT MODIFICATIONS WERE SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO THE PRINCIPLE OBSERVABLE STRUCTURAL DESIGN FEATURES OF LAUNCHERS. HE CITED CHANGE IN INTERNAL ELECTRICAL WIRING AS EXAMPLE OF MODERNIZATION WHICH WOULD NOT BE "MODIFICATION" UNDER US PROPOSAL, AND CITED CHANGE IN SILO DOORS AS EXAMPLE OF MODIFICATION. KOUKLEV SAW NO DIFFERENCE SINCE NO CHANGE IN LAUNCHER CATEGORY RESULTED IN EITHER CASE. SCHNEITER RESPONDED THAT MODIFICATION (VICE CONVERSION) DID NOT NECESSARILY BRING LAUNCHER INTO NEW CATEGORY. MCNEILL ADDED THAT

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08146 02 OF 02 261850Z

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W

-----128344 261852Z /41

P 261832Z MAY 78

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0162

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION USNATO

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 08146

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

MODIFICATION INVOLVED CHANGES IN SDF'S, WHILE MODERNIZATION DID NOT NECESSARILY HAVE THIS EFFECT, SCHNEITER RECONFIRMED SMOLIN'S UNDERSTANDING THAT CHANGES IN SDF'S WERE THOSE OBSERVABLE BY NTM. SMOLIN ASKED WHETHER, IN HARDENING MIRV AND NON-MIRV LAUNCHERS, SIDE HAD TO USE DIFFERENT MEANS EVEN THOUGH, TECHNOLOGICALLY, SAME MEANS APPROPRIATE. SCHNEITER RESPONDED THAT SO LONG AS MIRV AND NON-MIRV LAUNCHERS WERE DISTINGUISHABLE ON BASIS EXTERNALLY OBSERVABLE DESIGN FEATURES AT THE END OF THE PROCESS, SAME MEANS COULD BE USED.

7. KOUKLEV QUESTIONED APPLICABILITY OF US PROPOSAL TO SLBM LAUNCHERS SINCE, ONCE DEPLOYED, MIRV AND NON-MIRV SLBM LAUNCHERS WERE INDISTINGUISHABLE. ELDREDGE SAID DIFFERENCES IN SDF'S COULD BE OBSERVED BY NTM DURING CONVERSION PROCESS.

- II. DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION--ASSURED INOPERABILITY

8. PEREZ FORMALLY TABLED US PROPOSAL FOR AGREED STATEMENT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08146 02 OF 02 261850Z

TO ARTICLE XI.3 (REF B) UNDER WHICH SIDES WOULD RENDER SYSTEMS IN EXCESS OF 2250 AGGREGATE INOPERABLE BY APRIL 30, 1980, COMPLETE DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION IN THREE STAGES BY DECEMBER 31, 1980, AND IN WHICH CRITERIA FOR ASSURED INOPERABILITY WERE SET FORTH. AFTER PEREZ REPEATED RATIONALE FOR PROPOSAL, SMOLIN STATED THAT SOVIET CHIEF OF DELEGATION HAD NOT AGREED THIS SUBJECT COULD BE DISCUSSED IN DRAFTING GROUP. SMOLIN ADDED SOVIETS CONSIDERED PROPOSAL A STEP BACKWARDS AND DELAYING TACTIC IN CONTRAST TO PRECEDING US PROPOSAL, AND THAT QUESTIONS INVOLVED WERE PROVINCE OF SCC RATHER THAN SALT. HE SAID US REFERENCES TO SOVIET PROPOSALS "DISTORTED AND NULLIFIED" THEM, CONTRARY TO US ASSERTION THAT PROPOSAL COMPLEMENTED SOVIET POSITION. PEREZ RESPONDED THAT US CONSIDERED ITS PROPOSAL INTEGRAL PART OF PREVIOUS US POSITIONS, WHICH DRAFTING GROUP HAD ALREADY BEEN AUTHORIZED TO DISCUSS. PEREZ CLOSED BY NOTING THAT DELAYS ALLEGED BY SMOLIN WOULD RESULT ONLY IF SOVIETS REFUSED TO BEGIN DISCUSSION.

- III. ARTICLE VI.5

9. PEREZ TABLED REVISED US LANGUAGE FOR ARTICLE VI.5 (REF B), NOTING THAT IT EXPLICITLY ACKNOWLEDGED TYPE RULE OF ARTICLE II.3 AND EXPLICITLY ADDRESSED PROBLEM OF WHEN AN INDIVIDUAL AIRPLANE COUNTED IN THE AGGREGATE.

10. NEXT MEETING MAY 31. PEREZ

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETINGS, MISSILE WARHEADS, MIRV
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 26 may 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA08146
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780223-0593
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA USSALTTWO
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780515/aaaaampv.tel
Line Count: 207
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: feeab695-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 78 SALT TALKS 1760
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 17 feb 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2555136
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 218, MAY 25, 1978 (SALT TWO 1765)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/feeab695-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014